

Serial. No. 09/836,426
Confirmation No. 6845
Examiner: Shantese L. McDonald

REMARKS

The January 11, 2006 Office Action rejects all pending claims 1-33. Applicants amend claims 1 and 26; claims 1-33 (6 independent, 27 dependant claims) remain pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

In the Specification

Applicants submit herewith amendments to the specification to correct a typographical error in the first full paragraph on page 8 of the specification. The amendment clarifies that platen 504 orbits at about "500 to about 2000", rather than "500 to about 200," revolutions per minute.

In the Claims

Applicants hereby amend claims 1 and 26 to further clarify: in claim 1 that a workpiece comprises a low dielectric constant material and in claim 26 that the polishing surface orbits at a speed greater than about 500 orbits per minute.

Claim Rejections

As discussed in more detail below, Applicants submit, and reemphasize in light of previous responses, that all pending claims are patentable over the cited references because, in general, no combination of the references teaches or suggests a method or an apparatus for *polishing a surface of a workpiece comprising low-k material*. Furthermore, with respect to the various claim rejections, no combination of the cited references teaches or suggests any operating parameters or equipment portions for *polishing a workpiece surface comprising low-k material*.

Claims 1-9, 26-29 and 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,554,064, issued to Breivogel et al. on September 10, 1996 (hereinafter "Breivogel") in view of United States Patent No. 6,054,769, issued to Jeng on April 25, 2000 ("Jeng"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Serial. No. 09/836,426
Confirmation No. 6845
Examiner: Shantese L. McDonald

To render a claim obvious, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. There must be a reasonable expectation of success. In addition, the prior art relied upon must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. None of these criteria are met in this case.

Breivogel generally discloses a method and apparatus for polishing, employing offset axially rotating members (column 2, lines 55-60). Breivogel does not disclose any workpieces with low-k material, nor does it disclose or suggest any particular method, apparatus or portions thereof for removing material from a workpiece comprising low-k material.

Jeng discloses a workpiece including a polymeric low-k dielectric material as an interconnect. According to Jeng, the polymeric low-k material is selectively placed in desired areas by spinning the low-k material onto the workpiece surface and removing any excess material by *etching* (column 3, lines 4-6 and column 4, lines 33-34). Jeng further discloses that due to poor adhesion and other problems associated with low-k material, an inter-metal, interlayer dielectric is deposited over the low-k material and *that* is what is polished or planarized (column 3, lines 11-16). Jeng refers to SiO₂ as a *traditional* dielectric that may be polished, not a *low-k* dielectric (column 5, lines 6-20). Thus, Jeng teaches that polishing can be used for non-low-k dielectric materials, but not for polishing low-k materials. Accordingly, Jeng teaches away from the claimed invention and therefore cannot be combined with another reference to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

No combination of Breivogel and Jeng renders obvious claim 1 or any of claims 2-9 that depend therefrom because the references do not teach or suggest "An apparatus for polishing a surface of a workpiece, the surface including a low dielectric constant material" or, as the Examiner acknowledges, "a platen configured to orbit about an axis at a speed up to about 2000 revolutions per minute." A careful reading of Breivogel only discloses an axial rate of 140-220 orbits/minute, which is an order of magnitude less than that cited by the present invention. Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-9 that depend therefrom are not obvious over Breivogel in view of Jeng and Applicants therefore request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection. Furthermore, as noted above, neither reference teaches nor suggests polishing low-k material or any apparatus or methods for such polishing. At best the combination may teach polishing non-low-k material or etching low-k material.

Serial. No. 09/836,426
Confirmation No. 6845
Examiner: Shantese L. McDonald

Claims 2, 5-6 and 9 are additionally allowable over Breivogel in view of Jeng. Claim 2 is allowable over the cited references because neither reference teaches or suggests a "platen is configured to orbit at about an axis at about 1000 orbits per minute." Claim 3 is allowable because neither reference teaches or suggest a "platen is further configured to dither" Claims 5 and 6 are additionally allowable over Breivogel and Jeng because neither reference teaches or suggests a "platen...configured to move the workpicce relative to the polishing surface at a speed of about 0.8 to about 3.2 meters per second" as set forth in claim 5 or "the carrier is configured to apply about 0.25 to about 2 pounds per square inch pressure to the workpiece in the direction of the polishing surface" as set forth in claim 6.

Amended claim 26 is not obvious over Breivogel in view of Jeng because no combination of the references teaches or suggests "A method for removing material from a surface of a workpiece, including low-k material" or "providing a workpiece comprising low-k material" or "placing the workpiece comprising low-k material in contact with a polishing surface" or "orbiting the polishing surface at a speed greater than about 500 orbits per minute." Furthermore, because Breivogel does not teach or suggest any means for polishing a surface of a workpiece comprising low-k material, it would not be obvious for one skilled in the art to form the invention set forth in claim 26 and claims 27-29 that depend therefrom from the teachings of Breivogel in combination with Jeng, which only teaches *etching* low-k material. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection to claims 26-29.

Claims 32 and 33 are similarly patentable over Breivogel and Jeng because neither reference teaches or suggests "a workpiece carrier proximate the polishing surface, wherein the platen and the workpiece carrier are configured such that the surface of the workpiece comprising a *low dielectric constant material* and the platen move at a relative speed of about 0.8 to about 3.2 meters per second" as set forth in claim 32 or "A method for removing material from a surface of a workpiece, *including low-k material*" or "providing a workpiece comprising *low-k material*" or "placing the *workpiece comprising low-k material* in contact with a polishing surface" or "*moving the polishing surface and the workpiece comprising low-k material* relative to each other at a speed of about 0.8 to about 3.2 meters per second" as set forth in claim 33. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection to claims 32 and 33.

Serial. No. 09/836,426
Confirmation No. 6845
Examiner: Shantese L. McDonald

Claim 10 stands rejected under the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breivogel in view of Jeng and in further view of United States Patent No. 6,241,593 B1, issued to Chen et al. June 5, 2001 (hereinafter "Chen"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Chen generally discloses a carrier head, including a bladder, for use with a *rotary* platen polishing apparatus. Nowhere does Chen teach or suggest that the polishing head disclosed in Chen could be used with a polishing apparatus including an *orbiting* polishing station or polishing a workpiece comprising low-k material. Thus, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Breivogel and Jeng with Chen and even if the references were combined, the combination of the references does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, from which claim 10 depends. Specifically, no combination of the references teaches or suggests "An apparatus for polishing a surface of a workpiece, the surface including a low dielectric constant material" or "a platen configured to orbit about an axis at a speed up to about 2000 revolutions per minute." Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable over the cited references and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection to claim 10.

Claims 11, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breivogel as modified by Jeng in further view of United States Patent No. 6,416,384 B1, issued to Kawamoto et al. July 9, 2002 (hereinafter "Kawamoto"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Kawamoto only discloses a polishing apparatus including a *rotating* polishing table. Nowhere does Kawamoto teach or suggest an *orbiting* polishing apparatus or how one could combine the rotary platen teachings of Kawamoto with the orbiting polishing apparatus of Breivogel to form the claimed invention. Furthermore, even if Kawamoto, Breivogel and Jeng were combined, the combination does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Specifically, the combination does not teach or suggest "An apparatus for polishing a surface of a workpiece, the surface including a low dielectric constant material" or "a platen configured to orbit about an axis at a speed up to about 2000 revolutions per minute" as set forth in claim 1, from which claim 11 depends or "A method for removing material from a surface of a workpiece, including low-k material" or "providing a workpiece comprising low-k material" or "placing the workpiece comprising low-k material in contact with a polishing surface" or "orbiting the polishing surface at a speed greater than about 500 orbits per minute" as set forth in claim 26, from which claims 30 and 31 depend. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection to claims 11, 30, and 31.

Serial. No. 09/836,426
Confirmation No. 6845
Examiner: Shantese L. McDonald

Claims 12, 13, 17-20, 22, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breivogel as modified by Jeng as applied to claims 1-9, 26-29, 32 and 33, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,036,582, issued to Aizawa et al. March 14, 2000 (hereinafter "Aizawa"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Aizawa et al. generally discloses a chemical mechanical polishing apparatus divided into a plurality of rooms cleaned to different degrees. Nowhere do any of Aizawa et al., Breivogel, or Jeng teach or suggest any polishing apparatus or technique for removing material from a workpiece including low-k material as set forth in independent claims 12 and 25. Several of the limitations of these claims as well as the respective dependent claims are directed to apparatus or process techniques designed to remove particular material from a surface of a workpiece including low-k material. Because neither Aizawa, nor Breivogel teach or disclose apparatus or method for removing material from a workpiece that includes low-k material and Jeng only teaches removing low-k material using an *etch process*, no combination of the references renders obvious any of Applicants' claims directed to removing material from a workpiece including low-k material. Furthermore, as the Examiner acknowledges, no combination of the references teaches or suggests a "platen configured to move relative to a workpiece surface at about 0.8 to about 3.2 meters per second and a workpiece carrier configured to apply about 0.25 to about 2 psi to a workpiece in the direction of the platen" as set forth in claim 25. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection to claims 12, 13, 17-20, 22, 24 and 25.

Claims 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breivogel as modified by Aizawa and Jeng and in further view of Chen. Applicants traverse this rejection.

As previously noted, none of the cited references teaches or suggests any method or apparatus to remove material from a surface of a workpiece comprising low-k material using polishing techniques. Furthermore, no combination of these references teaches or suggests "A polishing system for removing material from a wafer surface, the wafer including low-k material" or "a plurality of polishing stations, wherein at least one of said plurality of polishing stations includes a platen configured to move at about 0.8 to about 3.2 meters per second relative to the wafer comprising low-k material" as set forth in claim 12, from which claims 14-

Serial. No. 09/836,426
Confirmation No. 6845
Examiner: Shantese L. McDonald

16 depend. Accordingly, claims 14-16 are patentable over the cited references and Applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection to claims 14-16.

Finally, claims 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breivogel as modified by Jeng and Aizawa, and in further view of Kawamoto. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claim 12 is not obvious in view of the cited references because no combination of these references teaches or suggests "A polishing system for removing material from a wafer surface, the wafer including low-k material" or "a plurality of polishing stations, wherein at least one of said plurality of polishing stations includes a platen configured to move at about 0.8 to about 3.2 meters per second relative to the wafer comprising low-k material." Accordingly, claims 21 and 23 that depend from claim 12 are not obvious in view of the cited references and Applicants therefore request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection to claims 21 and 23.

Serial. No. 09/836,426
Confirmation No. 6845
Examiner: Shantese L. McDonald

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the currently pending claims 1-33 (6 independent claims, 33 total claims) properly set forth that which Applicants regard as their invention and are allowable over the cited prior art.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (602) 382-6296 at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject Application. Applicants authorize and respectfully requests that any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. This statement does NOT authorize charge of the issue fee.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/11/06

By: Cynthia L. Pillote
Cynthia L. Pillote
Reg. No. 42,999

SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
Direct: (602) 382-6296
Fax: (602) 382-6070
Email: cpillote@swlaw.com

1818746.1